

with the rapidly expanding system as it is, no one really knows what the course will be.

We once again never heard any testimony on this point. This has sprung full-blown from the heads of the majority members of this Committee, and I would urge its rejection. Perhaps the most subtle and destructive part of the Majority Report is found in section 7, which places the Advisory Council on Higher Education in the constitution.

You can see by the letter that was on your desk today when you returned from lunch that this was over the dead body of the Advisory Council on Higher Education because they have urged that this whole Majority Report be struck and the Minority Report be substituted in its place. What this means is the Advisory Council, which was created also in 1963 and has some control over the course of higher education in Maryland by statute, would forever be stripped of this control by virtue of the fact that all three branches of higher education would receive constitutional autonomy. The roll of the Advisory Council would be relegated to that of assisting in the coordinating of programs of higher education. Consequently, higher education could ride off in three different directions, and the Advisory Council would have nothing to say about it; so despite the supposed favor done to the Advisory Council, they recognize the damage that this would bring about, and they urge the deletion of section 8.

I urge deletion of section 7. I will not engage in discussion of section 8. I think on its face its ambiguity is clear. No state constitution in this State has ever constitutionalized libraries. We feel there is no need for it, and I think that this explains the position of the minority with respect to the Majority Report.

The minority feels that education has flourished under Article 77 of the Maryland Code. If the theory of constitutional reward is really the test that the majority wants to use, then they should follow their lead and stick much more closely to the provisions of the existing Constitution under which this education system has flourished.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have one minute, Delegate Lord.

DELEGATE LORD: I think history indicates that the approach of the majority is against the best interests of education in this State, and also against the best interests of the people of this State.

I will be glad to answer any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions of the minority spokesman? Delegate Pullen.

DELEGATE PULLEN: Mr. Chairman, you made quite a point —

THE CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt a moment, Delegate Pullen? In view of the limited time for questions and the number of delegates standing to ask questions, the Chair will restrict each delegate to two questions.

DELEGATE PULLEN: Mr. Chairman, I cannot begin to cover the questions in two. I feel, sir —

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chair will limit you to two questions, and after the other delegates have asked their questions, if there is any remaining time, the Chair will recognize you.

DELEGATE PULLEN: I accept that, sir, with reluctance.

You make quite a point, Mr. Chairman, of the matter of length and detailed provisions. My question is this: have you considered 28 pages of the Minority Report creating 7½ pages plus amendments, executive branch 9½ pages, plus amendments, state finance and taxation 9½ pages, suffrage and elections 5 pages, plus amendments, legislative branch 8 pages, plus amendments, local government 5 pages, plus amendments, general provisions and education, 2 pages? What is your definition of length in comparison, sir?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Lord.

DELEGATE LORD: Dr. Pullen, I think I can best answer you by quoting an eminent authority on the subject of education who appeared before the Constitutional Convention Commission and offered testimony on the subject of education, and said:

“Now I think when we begin to write the constitution with respect to education, we must approach it from a constructive standpoint. This does not mean a long-winded affair at all. It can be done in a very few lines, but what you are doing here when you rewrite the Constitution of Maryland, you are rewriting the school system of Maryland.”

That authority was Dr. Thomas G. Pullen, Jr., former State Superintendent of Schools.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Pullen.